

REMARKS

The Office Action in the above-identified application has been carefully considered and this amendment has been presented to place this application in condition for allowance. Accordingly, reexamination and reconsideration of this application are respectfully requested.

Claims 1–10 are in the present application. It is submitted that these claims were patentably distinct over the prior art cited by the Examiner, and that these claims were in full compliance with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112. The changes to the claims, as presented herein, are not made for the purpose of patentability within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. sections 101, 102, 103 or 112. Rather, these changes are made simply for clarification and to round out the scope of protection to which Applicants are entitled.

Claims 1–4 and 6–9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Lavelle (French Patent Application 2,748,833). In the present invention, “said bus-access detection means being external to said controller and internal to said apparatus.” (Claim 1; Claim 6 contains similar limitations) As shown in Figure 1, the internal bus-address comparing circuit 6 is separate from the internal CPU 2 but still within the target system 1 (i.e. apparatus under test). Similarly, “said execution address detection means being external to said controller and internal to said apparatus” (Claim 2; Claim 7 contains similar limitations) is shown in Figure 1 as internal CPU execution address comparing circuit 7 being separate from the internal CPU 2 but still within the target system 1. Whereas, Lavelle discloses a probe 2 which samples the data exchanged over the internal buses of the computer 1. (Lavelle page 9) The sampled data is sent to the state detector 3 to detect specific conditions of the address bus. (Lavelle page 10) Based

on the arguments presented in the Office Action, Applicants believe Lavelle's state detector is being matched with the present invention's internal bus-address comparing circuit 6. However, as shown in Figure 1, the state detector 3 is external to the computer 1 (i.e. the apparatus under test). Further, Lavelle's probe samples the data, rather than sending all of the data to the detector. Whereas, because the present invention's bus-address comparing circuit 6 is located within the target system, all of the data can be compared in real time. Moreover, in the present invention, "information on each match is output to said external monitoring means in real time." (Claim 1; Claim 6 contains similar limitations) By contrast, Lavelle samples the data and then stores the sampled data in storage circuit 6 (along with dating bits indicating when the data was sampled). Hence, Lavelle does not monitor and output the results "in real time" as required in the present invention. Therefore, for at least these reasons, Lavelle fails to anticipate the present invention and the rejected claims should now be allowed.

Claims 5 and 10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lavelle in view of Fasang (U.S. Patent 4,433,413). Fasang is relied on solely to meet the numerically displayed data limitations recited in the rejected dependent claims. Accordingly, for the previously discussed reasons, the combination of Lavelle and Fasang fail to obviate the present invention and the rejected claims should now be allowed.

In view of the foregoing amendment and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the application as now presented is in condition for allowance. Early and favorable reconsideration of the application are respectfully requested.

No additional fees are deemed to be required for the filing of this amendment, but if such are, the Examiner is hereby authorized to charge any insufficient fees or credit any overpayment associated with the above-identified application to Deposit Account No. 50-0320.

If any issues remain, or if the Examiner has any further suggestions, he/she is invited to call the undersigned at the telephone number provided below. The Examiner's consideration of this matter is gratefully acknowledged.

Respectfully submitted,
FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG LLP

By:

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Darren M. Simon", written over a horizontal line.

Darren M. Simon
Reg. No. 47,946
(212) 588-0800